

REMARKS

In the February 11, 2008 Office Action, claims 1-6, 11, and 13-20 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the February 11, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1-6, 11, 13-17, and 20 and added new claims 24 and 25, as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-6, 11, 13-20, 24, and 25 are pending, with claims 1 and 11 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 11, and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,441 (Raymond) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,749,366 (Odagiri). In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11, as mentioned above.

More specifically, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that a motion detector is configured to detect changes in the shape of the mounting area, and to output a motion detection signal based on said changes.

Raymond was cited in the Office Action to show an information-gathering device, a sensor module, and a supporter having a first motion detector, a second motion detector, a pulse wave detector, a transmitter, a power generation device, and a processor. It is stated in the Office Action that Raymond does not teach a removal processor. Odagiri was cited in the Office Action to show the removal processor.

Applicants respectfully assert that prior art of record discloses detecting motions, but none of the prior art of record discloses that the motion detector detects the changes in the

shape of the mounting area. Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is *not* disclosed or suggested by Raymond, Odagiri, or any other prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an *apparent reason* for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of the information-gathering device.

As claim 11 has been similarly amended, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 11 is also allowable for the same or similar reasons stated above.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 2-6, 13-20, 24, and 25 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1 and 11, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-6, 13-20, 24, and 25 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 24 and 25. Claim 24 recites that said mounting area is a wrist of the body, and the changes are in thickness of said wrist. Claim 25 recites that the changes are made when the user clenches or unclenches.

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 24 and 25 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for

Appl. No. 10/803,088
Amendment dated May 12, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 11, 2008

the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-6, 13-20, 24, and 25 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1-6, 11, 13-20, 24, and 25 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Akiyoshi Onda/
Akiyoshi Onda
Limited Recognition No. L0336

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: May 12, 2008

S:\05-MAY08-AO\SE-US035173 Amendment.doc